

# STATE OF ILLINOIS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:	)	
THERESA GUNTER,	)	
Complainant,	)	
and 1012	) )Charge No:1996 (	CA
	)EEOC No: 21 B 960362 )ALS No: 11056	<u>?</u>
COOK COUNTY HOSPITAL,	) )	
Respondent.	,	

### RECOMMENDED ORDER AND DECISION

On June 26, 2002, this matter was scheduled for a status. Neither Party appeared. An order was issued setting a further status for July 24, 2002 and advising the Parties that failure to appear at the next scheduled hearing may result in dismissal of this matter on sua sponte motion. On July 24, 2002, Respondent appeared; Complainant did not appear. Respondent advised this tribunal that the pending federal court matter had been dismissed. This matter is ready for decision.

Based upon the record, I make the following findings of fact:

#### **Findings of Fact**

- 1. On November 30, 1995, Complainant filed a Charge with the Illinois Department of Human Rights (Department).
- 2. On October 5, 1999, the Department filed a Complaint on behalf of Complainant alleging Complainant to have been aggrieved by practices of age discrimination in violation of the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/1-101 et. seq.
- 3. On December 15, 1999, Respondent filed a verified answer to the Complaint.
- 4. On January 12, 2000, an order was entered granting Complainant's counsel leave to withdraw as attorney of record and setting a status for February 23, 2000.
- 5. On February 23, 2000, Respondent appeared; Complainant did not appear. An order was entered setting a discovery schedule and scheduling a final status for October 11, 2000.
- 6. On July 24, 2000, Respondent filed a motion to compel to be heard August 2, 2000.
- 7. On August 2, 2000, both Parties appeared; a status was set for September 7, 2000.
- 8. On September 7, 2000, both Parties appeared; a status was set for October 26, 2000; the October 11, 2000 final status was stricken.
- 9. On October 26, 2000, both Parties appeared; a status was set for November 20, 2000.

- 10. On November 20, 2000, both Parties appeared for status; a briefing schedule was set for dispositive motions.
- 11. On December 18, 2000, Respondent appeared on its motion for extension of time to file a dispositive motion; Complainant did not appear. An order was entered granting the extension and setting oral argument on the dispositive motion for March 7, 2001.
- 12. On January 8, 2001, the law firm of McCarthy & Bradford entered an appearance on behalf of the Complainant and filed a motion to stay the Commission proceedings pending the outcome of a similar matter filed in federal court.
- 13. On January 10, 2001, both Parties appeared on Complainant's motion to stay. An order was issued denying Complainant's motion to stay without prejudice and setting a final status for April 25, 2001.
- 14. On March 14, 2001, Complainant filed a second motion to stay.
- 15. With both Parties present, Complainant's motion was granted on March 21, 2001 and a status was set for September 19, 2001. The status was later rescheduled for September 26, 2001.
- 16. On September 26, 2001, Complainant appeared; Respondent did not appear. An order was issued setting a status on the progress of the federal matter for June 26, 2002.
- 17. On June 26, 2002, neither party appeared. An order was issued setting a status for July 24, 2002 and further warning Complainant that failure to appear may result in dismissal of this matter on sua sponte motion.
- 18. On July 24, 2002, Respondent appeared; Complainant did not appear. Respondent orally represented in open tribunal that the federal matter had been dismissed.
- 19. Respondent orally moved that this matter be dismissed for Complainant's failure to appear in accordance with my June 26, 2002 order and I granted the motion.

## **Conclusion of Law**

The failure of Complainant to appear for the June 26, 2002 and July 24, 2002 scheduled status hearings or to file other pleadings to indicate an interest in this matter since September 26, 2001 has resulted in unreasonable delay, justifying dismissal of this Complaint with prejudice.

#### Discussion

Section 5300.750(e) of the Procedural Rules of the Illinois Human Rights Commission authorizes a recommendation for dismissal with prejudice where a party fails to appear at a scheduled hearing without requesting a continuance reasonably in advance, or unreasonably refuses to comply with any Order entered, or otherwise engages in conduct which unreasonably delays or protracts the proceedings. Similarly, 775 ILCS 5/8A-102(I)(6) authorizes a recommended order of dismissal, with prejudice, or of default as a sanction for a party's failure to prosecute her case, appear at a hearing, or otherwise comply with this Act, the rules of the Commission, or a previous Order of the Administrative Law Judge.

When Complainant failed to appear for the June 26, 2002 scheduled hearing, I issued an order advising her that failure to appear for the July 24, 2002 status

may result in dismissal of this matter. As Complainant failed to appear for the July 24, 2002 scheduled status and further failed to file any other pleadings in this matter since the September 26, 2001 status hearing, I can take no other action in this matter except to dismiss it.

# **Recommendation**

Therefore, I recommend that this Complaint and the underlying Charge be dismissed with prejudice.

1	Α	n	Г	П	١	1	4	١.	N	[ ]	R	1	1	$\Box$	I	ľ	Г	S	١.	$\mathbf{C}$	n		V	T	١	1	I	S	(	3	I	N	1	1	Ī
J	ш		L	IJ	v	1	┲	١.			ľ	N	ľ	L				1.7	, ,	٠,	•	71	v		ıv			10	ж.	"	ľ		71	. `	1

By:\_\_\_\_

SABRINA M. PATCH Administrative Law Judge Administrative Law Section

**ENTERED:** August 6, 2002